

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT BECKLEY**

LARRY MICHAEL SLUSSER,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-cv-00114

WARDEN KATINA HECKARD,

Respondent.

ORDER

Pending is Petitioner’s Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1], filed February 13, 2023, and Petitioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 16], filed on May 10, 2023. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Omar J. Aboulhosn, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation (“PF&R”). Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn filed his PF&R on October 25, 2023. Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn recommended that the Court deny Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. §2241, deny Petitioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment, and dismiss this action.

The Court need not review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (“A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations *to which objection is made.*” (emphasis added)). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner’s right to appeal the Court’s order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v. De Leon-Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (Parties may not typically “appeal a magistrate judge’s


findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn't require de novo review absent objection."); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party "makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on November 13, 2023. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [**Doc. 22**], **DENIES** the Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [**Doc. 1**], **DENIES** the Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment [**Doc. 16**], and **DISMISSES** the matter.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: November 22, 2023



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Frank W. Volk". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Frank W. Volk
United States District Judge